

Amdt. dated July 26, 2004
Reply to Office action of May 25, 2004

Serial N . 09/613,085
Docket N . STL920000069
Firm N . 0054.0034

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

On July 14, 2004, the attorney for applications and the Examiner held a phone interview discussing an amendment to the independent claims 1, 5, and 9 to add requirements concerning the use of the claim elements of scope and specification. The Examiner indicated that such amendments would likely distinguish over the cited art and would consider entering such amendments. Applicants have amended the independent claims to clarify the meaning and use of the claim term scope. Applicants submit that the amended claims are patentable over the cited art and in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Edberg (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,381). Applicants traverse.

Amended claims 1, 5, and 9 recite translating a non-Unicode character string stored in a memory of the computer system into a Unicode character string stored in the memory of the computer system, and require: retrieving a specification of a code page in which the non-Unicode character string is encoded; retrieving a specification of one of a plurality of scopes, wherein each scope specifies a different a portion of a computer program subject to the translation according to the retrieved specification of the code page; and translating the non-Unicode character strings within the portion of the computer program applying the retrieved specification of the code page into the Unicode character strings.

Applicants amended claims 1, 5, and 9 to clarify that there are a plurality of scopes, each specifying a different portion of a computer program subject to the translation according to the retrieved specification of the code page and translating the non-Unicode character strings within the portion of the computer program applying the retrieved specification of the code page. Applicants request entry of this amendment because it clarifies the use of the scope and specification to translate Unicode character strings.

Applicants submit that nowhere does the cited Edberg teach or suggest the claim requirements that there are a plurality of scopes, each specifying a different a portion of a computer program subject to the translation according to the retrieved specification of the code page and translating the non-Unicode character strings within the portion of the computer program applying the retrieved specification of the code page.

Amdt. dated July 26, 2004
Reply to Office action f May 25, 2004

Serial No. 09/613,085
Docket No. STL920000069
Firm No. 0054.0034

The Examiner cited, with respect to claim 2, sections of Edberg with respect to the scope, such as col. 2, lines 1-67, co. 3, lines 57-61, and col. 4, lines 10-67. (Office Action, pg. 4) Applicants submit that these cited sections of Edberg do not teach or suggest the claim requirements of a plurality of scopes, each specifying a different a portion of a computer program subject to the translation according to the retrieved specification of the code page and translating the non-Unicode character strings within the portion of the computer program applying the retrieved specification of the code page.

The cited col. 2 discusses the Unicode system that is an encoding scheme independent of the design of the text. The cited col. 2 mentions that the Unicode standard provides character properties useful for parsing, sorting and other algorithms. The cited col. 3 mentions a mapping table providing a conversion code associated with a second character encoding and combining the conversion codes to form a target string. The cited col. 4 discusses a code conversion system. A scanning system scans an input character and program instructions are used for converting a source string into a target string that is scanned.

Nowhere does the above cited Edberg anywhere teach or suggest the claim requirements concerning a plurality of scopes, each specifying a different portion of a computer program subject to the translation according to the retrieved specification of the code page and then translating the non-Unicode character strings within the portion of the computer program applying the retrieved specification of the code page. Nowhere does the cited Edberg anywhere teach or suggest the concept of different scopes that are used to determine the portion of a program to which a retrieved code page specification applies.

Accordingly, the amended claims 1, 5, and 9 are patentable over the cited art because the cited Edberg does not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Claims 2-4, 6-8, and 10-12 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from amended claims 1, 5, and 9, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Further, the following dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 2, 6, and 10 depend from claims 1, 5, and 9 and further require that the scope is global, the global scope specifying that the translation applies to an entirety of the computer program.

Amdt. dated July 26, 2004
Reply to Office action f May 25, 2004

Serial No. 09/613,085
Docket No. STL920000069
Firm No. 0054.0034

The Examiner cited the above discussed cols. 2, 3, and 4 of Edberg as teaching the additional requirements of claims. (Office Action, pg. 4).

Applicants submit that nowhere does the cited Edberg anywhere teach that the scope is global indicating that the specification is used for translation with respect to an entirety of the computer program, as opposed to some other portion of the program.

Accordingly, claims 2, 6, and 10 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Applicants further submit that claims 3 and 4, 7 and 8 and 11 and 12 are patentable over the cited Edberg for the reasons discussed with respect to claims 2, 6, and 10 because they specify different scopes indicating that the specification is used for translation with respect to a subsequent portion of the program (claims 3, 7, and 11) and a specific constant (4, 8, and 12).


Accordingly, claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 11, and 12 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-12 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: July 26, 2004

By: 
David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984